UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,446	03/01/2004	Barbro Moberg-Alehammar	1018798-000224	9994
	7590 04/10/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	KIDWELL, MICHELE M		
ALEAANDKIA	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/788,446	MOBERG-ALEHAMMAR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michele Kidwell	3761		

	Whenele Mawell	6761
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR .	ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (left).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Michele Kidwell/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3761

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The examiner maintains the rejection in view of the current rejection because eth rationale as presented is supported in the disclsore of Hanson. The cited portion relating to the basis of the material used was relied on as teaching of the structure including the liquid permeable covering layer (46). As noted in the rejection, Hanson provides a covering layer wherein at least a portion of it is spunbond with the claimed denier that ultimately provides the claimed contact angle. Hanson discloses such in col. 7, lines 36 - 40. Hanson also discloses that layer 46 specifically incorporates these features in col. 21, lines 48-50. Likewise, the disclose at col. 24, lines 31-41 provides the knowledge, suggestion and motivitation to modify parameters in order to achieve desired product. With respect to the argument regarding the pore radius, the examiner disagrees. The cited passage states that no more that 5% are greater than 50 micrometers. In such case, 95% would have to be greater than 50 micrometers and would therefore meet the claimed limitations. In either case, the general disclosure is provided and a modification would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.